

Appl. No. : 09/836,674
Filed : April 16, 2001

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Matters of Form

Applicants have corrected the informalities in Claims 1, 20 and 36.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 16-18 and 21-26

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-13, 16-18 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suntola (U.S. Patent No. 6,015,590). Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suntola in view of Soininen et al (U.S. 5,855,680). Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suntola in view of Mochizuki et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,166,092). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of these claims. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 as outlined below. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these claims in their original or similar form in a continuing application.

With respect to independent Claim 1, as amended, this claim recites, in part, "providing at least a first substrate in a pre-reaction chamber and a second substrate in a reaction chamber, said first substrate being positioned downstream of a point in the pre-reaction chamber where both said first and said second phase reactants have entered the pre-reaction chamber and said pre-reaction chamber being serially aligned downstream only with said reaction chamber." In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner states that the inflow channel 7 of Suntola "reads on applicant's pre-reactor." However, the reactants in the inflow channel 7 are distributed evenly between "in-parallel stacked reaction chambers 13." Col. 9, lines 24-25. As such, the inflow channel 7 of Suntola is not serially aligned with the reaction chambers nor does Suntola disclose positioning a substrate in the inflow channel 7. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-13, 16-18 and 21-26 depend upon allowable Claim 1 and for, at least this reason, are also in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. : 09/836,674
Filed : April 16, 2001

Claim 20

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suntola (U.S. Patent No. 6,015,590). Claim 20 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suntola in view of Soininen et al (U.S. 5,855,680). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of this claim. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended Claim 20 as outlined below. Applicants reserve the right to pursue this claim in its original or similar form in a continuing application.

As amended, Claim 20 recites, in part, "the reaction product [being] deposited on a removable medium positioned upstream of said substrate and downstream of a point where both the first and second vapor phase reactants have entered the reaction chamber; [and] removing said removable medium from said reaction chamber." In rejecting Claim 20, the Examiner states that the "inflow channel 7 reads on applicant's removable medium" because "parts of a reactor inherently can be replaced, as evidenced by Soininen." However, Applicants note that Suntola discloses a reaction chamber pack 1 assembled from mutually identical, stacked planer elements 10, in which the gas flow channels 7, 4 and reaction chambers 12 are formed by openings and notches made to the planer elements. See Col. 8, lines 31-40. Accordingly, replacing the inflow channel 7 of Suntola, as suggested by the Examiner, would require disassembling the reactions chambers 12. Therefore, it is simply not possible to remove the inflow channel 7 from the reaction chamber of Suntola. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 20 is in error.

Claim 36

Claim 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suntola. As with the previous claims, Applicants respectfully disagrees with the rejection of this claims. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended Claim 36 as outlined below. Applicants reserve the right to purse this claim in its original or similar form in a continuing application.

Claim 36 now recites, in part, that "the reaction product is deposited in an independent pre-reaction chamber serially aligned downstream only with said reaction chamber and positioned upstream of said substrate and downstream of a point where both the first and second vapor phase reactants have entered the reaction chamber." As noted above, Suntola, the reactants in the inflow channel 7 distributed evenly between in-parallel stacked reaction chambers 13. Col. 9, lines 24-25.

Appl. No. : 09/836,674
Filed : April 16, 2001

As such, Suntola does not disclose a method in which the reaction product is deposited in an independent pre-reaction chamber serially aligned with said reaction chamber and positioned upstream of said substrate and downstream of a point where both the first and second vapor phase reactants have entered the reaction chamber. For at least this reason, Claim 36 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: July 21, 2004

By: Rabinder N. Narula

Rabinder N. Narula
Registration No. 53,371
Attorney of Record
2040 Main Street
Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\NRNN\NRNN-8670.DOC
072104